REMARKS

There are at least two major differences between every one of Applicant's embodiments and the cited prior art combination of references. First, Applicant's invention adhesively bonds *directly* to the fingertip. The adhesive is located between the finger and the invention. In contrast, the *Walker* reference uses adhesive on the *outside* of the invention so that a pen sticks to the exterior of the glove—not to the finger. Column 2, lines 46-50; col.5, lines 1-9; col.8, lines 30-31; and Abstract, lines 7-8. The *Bishop* reference does not mention any form of an adhesive. Second, all of Applicant's embodiments are rotationally symmetric about their axes. However, neither prior art reference discloses even a single embodiment that is rotationally symmetric about an axis. *Bishop* is closer to symmetric than *Walker*, but clearly Figure 3 of *Bishop* indicates that it is not rotationally symmetric. Furthermore, there are many other embodiment-specific differences between the present invention and the prior art, which are discussed below.

For example, Applicant's first embodiment is covered by claims 12-16. In addition to the two distinguishing features described in the preceding paragraph, these claims require "a dome having...an axial opening located opposite the base surface." *Bishop* has a base surface 16, but is closed solid on the opposite end. *Walker* merely discloses a glove that has no elements like claims 12-16. In addition, these claims require "a pin...extending from the base surface of the dome through the axial opening of the dome." *Bishop's* pin 24 is located exclusively on the exterior of the housing 14.

Dependent claim 13 adds that the base surfaces of the dome and the pin are "co-planar to define a single contact surface for contacting the device with the fingertip." As clearly shown in Figure 1 of *Bishop*, no portion of the pen 24, 20 touches any part of the finger of the user. Claim 14 states that "the adhesive layer is circular and covers the entire base surfaces of both the dome and the pin, and wherein the adhesive layer is perforated for absorbing deposits of perspiration on the fingertip." As stated above, the only adhesive used by either reference is on the exterior of the glove of *Walker*. It is impossible to characterize *Walker* in the manner described by claim

14 since *Walker* is completely lacking the structural elements on which the adhesive is required to be located. Claim 16 requires the pin to have "an exterior profile that is contoured to a shape of the axial cavity of the dome." The pen 24, 20 of *Walker* merely follows the exterior of its dome 14. Each of these claims is allowable for the same reasons as claim 12 and for their own further distinguishing characteristics.

Claims 17-20 are directed to the second embodiment (Figures 4 and 5) of the present invention, which comprises a two-cavity, completely integrated design. These claims contain so many elements that differ from the cited references that Applicant is again confused as to how the references could possible be cited against them. For example, claim 17 requires "a dome having...an outer wall, an inner wall, an outer cavity located between the outer and inner walls adjacent to the perimeter, an inner cavity located radially inward of the inner wall relative to the axis, the inner cavity having an axial dimension that is greater than an axial dimension of the outer cavity, the entire dome being formed from a single material such that the dome molds to a fingertip but is hard enough for the tip to actuate keys, and each of the inner and outer cavities forming a vacuum between the dome and the fingertip." This unique structure (e.g., multiple walls, cavities, their interplay, and a single material) are so different from the devices of the cited references that they cannot be compared. The remaining claims require symmetry among all of the components, co-planarity, and adhesive and cavity contact to form both bonding and vacuum retention, respectively.

The final set of claims, 21-25, are directed to the third embodiment of Figures 6 and 7. These claims require many of the same elements as the preceding claims, while requiring their own unique structural limitations. For example, claims 21-25 require rotational symmetry, an inlay, the inlay to fill the entire axial cavity, for the inlay to have a smaller axial dimension than the dome, and for the inlay to be compressible. None of these features are found in the cited prior art combination. Moreover, claims 22-25 require the following unique elements: a

lenticular inlay, co-planar base surfaces of the inlay and dome, inlay contoured to axial cavity, and for the adhesive to only cover the base surface of the dome, not the inlay.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and favorable action is requested. No extension of time is believed to be required. However, in the event that an extension of time is required, please charge that extension fee and any other required fees to **IBM Corporation Deposit Account Number 50-0563.**

Respectfully submitted,

Michael E. Noe, Jr.
Reg. No. 44,975
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 969
Austin, Texas 78767-0969
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS